- 8 -

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on September 18, 2006. Claims 29-58 are standing for examination. Claims 29, 30, 34-37, 41-44, 48-51 and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Iwami et al. (U.S. 5,604,737) hereinafter Iwami. Claims 31, 32, 33, 38, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 52, 53 and 54 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwami in view of Chang et al. (US 6,198,738 B1) herinafter Chang. Claims 32, 39, 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwami in view of Mitel (GB 2 315 190 A) hereinafter Mitel.

In response to the Examiner's rejections and remarks, applicant herein amends the claims to include subject matter considered patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Applicant also provides arguments which clearly show that the claims, as amended, are patentable over the art of Iwami, Chang and Mitel, either singly, or in combination. Claims 32, 39, 46, 53 and 58 are herein canceled as their limitations have been added to the base claims by amendment.

Applicant herein amends the independent claims to positively recite that the routing processor accesses a digitally-stored look-up table relating COST telephone numbers to IP addresses, and retrieves specific data from an incoming call, either COST or DNT, and uses the retrieved data to access the look-up table to determine an associated COST telephone number or IP address, and to use the associated COST telephone number or IP address to place a call associated with the incoming call.

The Examiner states; "Iwami is silent or deficient to the further limitation of a look up table relating telephone numbers to IP addresses. In particular, Iwami teaches using extension numbers, see e.g., figure 18. Chang teaches the further recited limitation above at e.g., column 4, lines 6-25 since the ULS server contains a database of address translations.

The proposed modification of the above-applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter would be to modify Iwami by clarifying that a translation table can

- 9 -

also contain IP addresses." The Examiner also states that; "Mitel teaches the further recited limitation above at e.g., page 9 first full paragraph since the gateway provides a one-to-one mapping function between the user's telephone number and TCP/IP address."

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the art of Chang or Mitel teaches accessing a digitally-stored look-up table relating COST telephone numbers to IP addresses, and wherein the processor is adapted to retrieve specific data from an incoming call, either COST or DNT, and to use the retrieved data to access the look-up table to determine an associated COST telephone number or IP address, and uses the associated COST telephone number or IP address to place a call associated with the incoming call.

Chang teaches for PSTN to Internet call control, the IPR (Internet Phone Register) identifies the ULS (Universal Location Service) server where the Internet phone is registered based on the E.164 address or other host alias address. It queries that ULS server for the PC's TIPA (Temporary Internet Protocol Address) and responds with that address

to the gateway. Thus the IPR does not actually store the TIPA, but identifies the correct ULS, queries that ULS and then responds with that answer back to the gateway. For PSTN to Internet calls, each ULS server contains a table to translate between E.164 addresses or other alias addresses and temporary IPAs (TIPAs). The ULS server maintains a record to determine whether the terminating Internet phone is active and able to receive a call and responds with the TIPA and the status of the Internet station to the IPR.

Applicant argues that Chang teaches locating a mobile Internet station by translating stationary IP addresses to TIPAs. E.164 and alias addresses of Chang cannot read on retrieving specific data from an incoming call, as claimed. There is no specific teaching in Chang of accessing a digitally-stored look-up table relating COST telephone numbers to IP addresses, and wherein the processor is adapted to retrieve specific data from an incoming call, either COST or DNT, and to use the retrieved data to access the look-up table to determine an associated COST telephone number or IP address, as claimed.

Applicant argues that Mitel has a limited teaching of accessing an IP address

- 10 -

based upon the incoming circuit or called party number info (i.e. the number the caller dials to access the gateway), not retrieve specific data from an incoming call, <u>either</u> <u>COST or DNT</u>, and to use the retrieved data to access the look-up table to determine an associated COST telephone number or IP address, as claimed.

Applicant's invention teaches that control routines receive a first incoming call and extract specific data encoded into the incoming call, <u>regardless of whether the incoming call is a COST call or Internet call</u>. Applicant's independent claims specifically recites that control routines receive a first incoming call from one of the COST and Internet networks, extract specific data encoded into the incoming call, either COST or IPNT, and use the extracted data to access the look-up table to determine an associated COST telephone number or IP address". In the case of an incoming Internet call, a COST telephone number may be encoded <u>by an agent</u> in the call center into an IP address of the computerized bridge, and the bridge has control routines which extract that COST number from the IP address or other header in an incoming IP call from the call center. The coded portion of the IP address may also have just a key instead of the entire cost number, and the key may allow look-up in a stored table at the bridge to ascertain the cost number to which the call may be connected and translated. Applicant believes that encoding and extracting such specific information from an incoming call, whether the call be a COST call or an IPNT call, for the purpose of using the extracted information to access a look-up table to determine a destination number or IP address for placing a second call related to the first incoming call, is a key and patentable distinction over the prior art.

Therefore, applicant believes independent claims 29, 36, 43, 50 and 57 are patentable, as amended and argued above. Dependent claims 30-31, 33-35, 37-38, 40-42, 44-45, 47-49, 51-52 and 54-56 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

The applicant is confident that the art cited and applied does not teach the patentable features of these claims, as claimed, and therefore solicits allowance, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

- 11 -

If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid by check with this response, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully,
Dan Kikinis

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 768-1755